# PLEASE STAMP TO ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF THE FOLLOWING:

2132

In r Application of: Karl L. Ginter, et al.

Ser al No.: 09/678,252

Filed: October 3, 2000

Group Art Unit: 2132

**Examiner: Not Yet Assigned** 

SYSTEMS AND METHODS FOR SECURE TRANSACTION MANAGEMENT AND

**ELECTRONIC RIGHTS PROTECTION** 

Information Disclosure Statement (2 pages)

2. Form PTO-1449 (3 pages)

3. 48 references

4. Notice of Pending Litigation (4 pages)

5. Exhibits A-M

RECEIVED

NOV 0 1 2002

Technology Center 2100

Dated: October 31, 2002 Attorney: Karna J. Nisewaner

Docket No.: 07451.0001-15000 Mail Drop: CA

Washington, DC 20231

Sir:

#### NOTICE REGARDING RELATED LITIGATION

Applicants hereby notify the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office that several patents assigned to InterTrust Technologies Corporation ("InterTrust") are involved in litigation. The present application, Serial No. 09/678,252, is a continuation of U.S. Application Serial No. 09/328,671, issued as U.S. Patent No. 6, 389,402 B1, which is a continuation of U.S. Application Serial No. 08/964,333, issued as U.S. Patent No. 5,982,891, both of which are patents at issue in the litigation. Those applications claim the benefit of priory of a common parent with U.S. Patent Nos. 6,389,402 B1; 6,253,193 B1; 6,185,683 B1; 5,949,876; 5,917,912; 5,915,019; and 5,892,900, which are also at issue in the litigation.

FINNEGAN HENDERSON FARABOW GARRETT& DUNNER LLP





2122

213

Customer Number 22,852 Attorney Docket No. 07451.0001.15

InterTrust Ref. No.: IT-5.0.1.1

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:	)
Karl L. GINTER et al.	) Group Art Unit: 2162
Serial No.: 09/678,252	) Examiner: Not Yet Assigned
Filed: October 3, 2000	)
For: SYSTEMS AND METHODS FOR SECURE TRANSACTION MANAGEMENT AND ELECTRONIC RIGHTS PROTECTION	RECEIVED  NOV 0 1 2002
Commissioner for Patents Washington, DC 20231	Technology Center 2100

Sir:

### NOTICE REGARDING RELATED LITIGATION

Applicants hereby notify the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office that several patents assigned to InterTrust Technologies Corporation ("InterTrust") are involved in litigation. The present application, Serial No. 09/678,252, is a continuation of U.S. Application Serial No. 09/328,671, issued as U.S. Patent No. 6, 389,402 B1, which is a continuation of U.S. Application Serial No. 08/964,333, issued as U.S. Patent No. 5,982,891, both of which are patents at issue in the litigation. Those applications claim the benefit of priory of a common parent with U.S. Patent Nos. 6,389,402 B1; 6,253,193 B1; 6,185,683 B1; 5,949,876; 5,917,912; 5,915,019; and 5,892,900, which are also at issue in the litigation.

FINNEGAN HENDERSON FARABOW GARRETT& DUNNER LLP



The status of the litigation is as follows. On April 26, 2001, InterTrust filed a Complaint alleging that Microsoft Corporation ("Microsoft") was infringing U.S. Patent No. 6,185,683 B1, assigned to InterTrust. See InterTrust Tech. Corp. v. Microsoft Corp., (C 01-1640 SBA, N. D. Ca.). A copy of the Complaint is attached as Exhibit A. On June 26, 2001 and July 26, 2001, InterTrust amended its complaint to add U.S. Patent Nos. 6,253,193 B1; 5,920,861; and 5,940,504. See Exhibit B.

On August 29, 2001, Microsoft filed its Answer to InterTrust's Second Amended Complaint. See Exhibit C. On September 17, 2001, Microsoft filed a First Amended Answer and Counterclaims, asserting twelve affirmative defenses, including, inter alia, non-infringement, invalidity, dedication to the public, prosecution history estoppel, and inequitable conduct, and counterclaiming for declaratory judgments of non-infringement and invalidity of the InterTrust patents, and for infringement of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,049,671 and 6,256,668 B1, allegedly assigned to Microsoft. See Exhibit D.

On October 26, 2001, InterTrust filed a Third Amended Complaint to add U.S. Patent Nos. 5,917,912; 5,892,900; and 5,982,891. See Exhibit E. Microsoft filed its Answer and Counterclaims to InterTrust's Third Amended Complaint on November 8, 2001, see Exhibit F, and filed an Amended Answer and a "Corrected" Amended Answer on November 14 and 15, respectively, see Exhibits G and H, asserting several additional affirmative defenses and counterclaims. See, e.g., id. at pages 9 and 13-19.

FINNEGAN HENDERSON FARABOW GARRETT& DUNNER LLP

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The '504 patent was subsequently dismissed from this suit.

On February 6, 2002, InterTrust filed a second lawsuit against Microsoft, alleging infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,157,721 ("the '721 patent"). See Exhibit I.<sup>2</sup> Microsoft filed its Answer and Counterclaims on March 25, 2002, and filed a First Amended Answer and Counterclaims on April 12, 2002, asserting thirteen affirmative defenses, including, inter alia, non-infringement, invalidity, dedication to the public, prosecution history estoppel, inequitable conduct, and unenforceability, and counterclaiming for declaratory judgment of non-infringement and invalidity. See Exhibit J. On June 5, 2002, Microsoft served its Initial Disclosures Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1), identifying various technologies believed by Microsoft to bear on the validity of the '721 patent. See Exhibit K.

On July 30, 2002, InterTrust filed a motion for leave to file a Fourth Amended Complaint, adding claims of infringement of additional InterTrust patents. This motion was granted on October 22, 2002. The Fourth Amended Complaint was filed on October 24, 2002, adding to the case claims of infringement of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,112,181; 5,915,019; 5,949,876; and 6,389,402 B1. *See* Exhibit L.

On August 16, 2002, Microsoft served its Preliminary Invalidity Contentions Regarding U.S. Patent Nos. 6,253,193 B1 and 6,185,683 B1 ("Preliminary Invalidity Contentions"). See Exhibit M. In its Preliminary Invalidity Contentions, Microsoft asserts that certain claims in those patents are indefinite, lack enablement, and lack an adequate written description. Microsoft also asserts that certain claims are anticipated or rendered obvious by various references. See id. at pages 3-7.

FINNEGAN HENDERSON FARABOW GARRETT& DUNNER LLP

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> This case has since been consolidated with the case filed April 26, 2001.

### REMARKS

In support of its claim that InterTrust's U.S. Patent Nos. 5,892,900; 5,920,861; and 6,157,721 are unenforceable, Microsoft cites three references: (1) an article entitled <u>DigiBox: A Self-Protecting Container for Information Commerce</u>, by Olin Sibert et al. ("the Sibert article"); (2) PCT Publication No. WO 96/27155 ("the PCT Publication"); and (3) U.S. Patent No. 5,910,987 ("the '987 patent"). Applicants note that the Sibert article was cited in connection with the present application in an IDS filed December 20, 2001. Applicants also note that the PCT Publication is the international counterpart of U.S. Application No. 08/388,107 ("the '107 application"), a parent of the present application, and that the '987 patent is a continuation of the '107 application.

If there are any fees due with the filing of this Notice not already accounted for, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916

By:

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: October 30, 2002

Karna J. Nisewan Reg. No. 50,665

FINNEGAN HENDERSON FARABOW GARRETT& DUNNER LLP